IN THE COURT OF

Judgement in Calendar Case No.31 of 1911 on the file of the Joint Magistrate of Chengalpattu.

Complainant: Olappakkam Ramanujacharier of Conjeevaram.

Accused: P.B.Annangarracharier of Conjeevaram.

Offence: Section 500 IPC.

Finding: Guilty

Sentence: Convicted and sentenced to suffer simple imprisonment for 20 days.

Description of accused: Name	Father's name	Caste or religion	Occupation	Residence	Age	Date of occurrence.
P.B.Annangarracharier.	P.B.Ranghacharier.	Brahmin	Land Lord	L.Conjeevaram.	20	About the 12th day of September

The accused a Thengalai Brahmin aged 20 is charged with deforming the complaint a Vadagalai brahmin by publishing a pamphlet in which it is stated that the complaint said in three courts that the complainant was the song of a prostitute and that he was begotten by his mother openly living with several men and in which it was stated that he was living on his wife's prostitution.

2. In C.No.102/1910 the complainant charged the accused with deforming him in a sanskrit work. The case was summarilily dismissed by me, and that the High Court ordered its retrial. The accused tendered an apology which the complainant accepted and was discharged on September, 2nd 1911.

3. On September, 6th accused went to Madras and got the Manager of the Presidency Press P.W.3. to print a pamphlet Exhibit.A. which was struck on September, 7th. He gave P.W.4. a copy of this in sealed later. This phamplet contains deforamtory remarks against the complainant with which accused is now charged.

Scanned with CamScanner

4. The ... ed the complainant and apologised in Court, and accused deliberately and deformed him again and published the deformation. The accused admits the publication of the pamplet in para 5 of his statement. He pleads in Examination that the complainant abused him and he apoligised for the second deformation also. He further states that the pamphlet does not contain deformatory matter.

5. I have examined 2 witness on his behalf. D.W.1.Says that the accused apoligized in the complainant's house and D.W.2. that he distributed for the accused apoligized, but does not withdrawn the statements made in the pamphlets. The accused has only cited witness to establish ~~xxx~~ the above points that he apoligized in the house and circulated a notice. I have not examined more than two of these witnesses as I consider that the points may be accepted (although the complainant desires them) without affecting the case. The accused dos not call any evidence to prove justifiention, although in para 10 of his statements he says that pamplets is not deformatory. He replies apparently on the ambiguity of certain phrases, but I have examined the prosecuting Inspector, K R. ethuraman as Court witness and he says that the pamphlet states that the complainant has accumulated a large sum by selling his wife without fear or regs. He has called an additional witness who I examined as C.W.II who says that it may mean selling his wife of what a Brahmin should not sell. I have not doubt that the accused meant that it may mean selling his wife.

6. I find that the accused deformed the complainant by publishing that he was accumulating a large sum of money by selling his wife without fear or shame.

7. The fact that the accused may or may not have apoligized after the second insult is not very important considering that accused's first apoligy was obviously insincere.

8. The circulated apology in itself contains no-withdrawal of the libel and the accused even now says that the pamphlet is not deformatory.

9. The accused has rendered himself liable a very severe sentence. But taking into consideration that he is ~~xxx~~ young and of an applicable character, in that he is prevented to insult an apologize, to insult again and to apologize again. However, I cannot treat him entirely

pto

Scanned with CamScanner

with contempt as feeling runs high between thengalays and vadagalais and repeated insult from a thengalay to a vadagali are not alt gether insignificant.

10. It will be little use to fine the accused for I suppose that he command a certain following among the thengalays who will pay a fine inflicted for insulting vadagalay.

11. I sentence accused to 28 days simple imprison ent under section 500 IPC.

Sd. J.R.S.Jackson
Joint Magistrate 6-1-1912.

/true copy/

CS Scanned with CamScanner